arXiv:1612.07340v1 [math.OC] 21 Dec 2016

SYMBOLIC COMPUTATION IN HYPERBOLIC PROGRAMMING

SIMONE NALDI AND DANIEL PLAUMANN

Abstract. Hyperbolic programming is the problem of computing the infimum of a linear function when restricted to the hyperbolicity cone of a hyperbolic polynomial, a generalization of semidefinite programming. We propose an approach based on symbolic computation, relying on the multiplicity structure of the algebraic boundary of the cone, without the assumption of determinantal representability. This allows us to design exact algorithms able to certify the multiplicity of the solution and the optimal value of the linear function.

Introduction

Semidefinite programming (SDP) constitutes a popular class of convex optimization problems for which approximate solutions can be computed through a variety of numerical algorithms, the most efficient of which are based on primal-dual interior point methods. On the other hand, exact algorithms for general semidefinite programs have been developed only much more recently in the work of Henrion, Safey El Din and the first author in [8]. The optimizer in an SDP problem corresponds to a positive semidefinite real symmetric matrix. While symbolic algorithms obviously have a much higher complexity than numerical ones, finding exact solutions has many benefits, especially regarding certification of the solution. For instance, the rank of the optimizer, which is often a meaningful quantity, can be determined exactly by the algorithm in [8], and one can even optimize over all feasible points of bounded rank, which is a non-convex optimization problem [12].

In this paper, we consider analogous algorithmic questions in the more general framework of *hyperbolic programming*. We briefly summarize the underlying notions: A real homogeneous polynomial f in several variables $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is called *hyperbolic* with respect to a point $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$ if $f(e) \neq 0$ and the polynomial $f(te - a) \in \mathbb{R}[t]$ has only real zeros for every $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The general determinant of symmetric matrices has this property with respect to the unit matrix $e = \mathbb{I}_d$, since $\det(t\mathbb{I}_d - A)$ is the classical characteristic polynomial of the real symmetric matrix A. Hyperbolic polynomials can therefore be seen as generalized characteristic polynomials. If f is hyperbolic with respect to e, the hypersurface defined by f bounds a convex cone containing e, the *hyperbolicity cone*, generalizing the cone of positive semidefinite matrices in case of the determinant. The zeros of $f(te - a)$ can be regarded as generalized eigenvalues of $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the multiplicity of the root $t = 0$ of $f(te - a)$ as the corank of a. A

Date: December 23, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14Q20, 68W30, 90C22, 90C25.

hyperbolic program is the convex optimization problem of maximizing a linear function over the hyperbolicity cone of a hyperbolic polynomial. SDP is the special case in which f is the restriction of the determinant to a linear subspace. Hyperbolic programming can be solved numerically with interior point methods much like SDP [3, 7, 13]. One



FIGURE 1. An affine section of a hyperbolic quartic surface with four nodes

of the major challenges in hyperbolic programming, when compared to SDP, is the lack of an explicit duality theory, while SDP duality is always heavily exploited. The methods in [8] rely on the good properties of determinantal varieties, which provide an explicit non-singular lifting of the variety of symmetric matrices of bounded rank in a given subspace. The same is not available for hyperbolic programming. However, hyperbolicity of a real polynomial still imposes some strong conditions on the structure of the real part of the singular locus of the hypersurface.

Let us give an overview of our main results. Given a hyperbolic polynomial f, let $\Gamma_m \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be the set of points of multiplicity at least m (see Section 2) and let Λ_+ be the hyperbolicity cone (Section 1). We show that if m equals the maximal multiplicity on Λ_+, then Λ_+ contains one of the real connected components of Γ_m, proving that $\Gamma_m \cap \Lambda_+$ is the union of some components of Γ_m (Theorem 5). Thus a point of maximal multiplicity (analogous to the minimal rank in SDP) can be found by sampling the connected components of Γ_m. Since Γ_m is an algebraic set (rather than just semialgebraic), this reduces to a standard problem in computational real algebraic geometry. Furthermore, we show that the more general convex hyperbolic programming problem over Λ_+ is equivalent to computing local minimizers over the sets Γ_m of the same linear function (Theorem 9). This can be carried out in practice

using Lagrange multipliers, provided that the corresponding set of critical points has complex dimension 0. We use these results to design an exact algorithm for hyperbolic programming. Applying this to explicit examples yields interesting results that are discussed in the final part.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section 1, we summarize standard definitions and results about hyperbolicity cones. In Section 2, we describe the multiplicity structure of the algebraic boundary of Λ_+ and prove our main result on the maximal multiplicity. This is used to certify feasible multiplicities in the case where Λ_+ is the d-elliptope. In Section 3, we formalize the relationship between solutions to hyperbolic programming problems and the multiplicity loci Γ_m. Our algorithm solving hyperbolic programming in exact arithmetic is implemented in Maple; we finally discuss the results of our tests.

Acknowledgements. Work on this project was partially supported through DFG grant PL 549/3-1 *Convexity in Real Algebraic Geometry.*

1. Preliminaries

The following notation is used throughout. The ring of real polynomials in $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is denoted by $\mathbb{R}[x]$, with its natural grading $\mathbb{R}[x] = \bigoplus_d \mathbb{R}[x]_d$. The complex algebraic set defined by polynomials $f_1, \ldots, f_s \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ is denoted by $Z(f) = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : \forall\, i\ f_i(x) = 0\}$, and its subset of real points by $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(f) = Z(f) \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. The closure of a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ in the Euclidean topology (resp. Zariski topology) of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is $\overline{S}$ (resp. Zar(S)). Its Euclidean boundary is ∂S.

Recall from the introduction that a homogeneous polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ of degree d is called *hyperbolic* with respect to a point $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$ if $f(e) \neq 0$ and $f(te + a) \in \mathbb{R}[t]$ has only real roots for every $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Up to rescaling f, we may suppose that $f(e) = 1$, and we often say that f is just *hyperbolic*, without specifying the direction e.

The polynomial

$$t \mapsto \mathrm{ch}_a(t; f, e) = f(te - a)$$

is called the *characteristic polynomial* of $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (with respect to f and e). This will be denoted simply by $\mathrm{ch}_a(t)$ when f, e are understood from the context. For $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the ordered roots $\lambda_1(a) \leq \lambda_2(a) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_d(a)$ of ch_a are called the *eigenvalues* of a. The set

$$\Lambda_{++}(f, e) = \{a \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_1(a) > 0\}$$

is called the *open hyperbolicity cone* of f with respect to e. This is an open, convex cone containing e [4]. We will simply denote it by Λ_{++} when f is fixed. It is independent of the choice of e within Λ_{++}, by the following basic result.

Theorem 1 (Gårding [4], Renegar [18])**.** *The cone Λ_{++} is convex, open and coincides with the connected component of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus Z_{\mathbb{R}}(f)$ containing e. Moreover, f is hyperbolic with respect to e' for all $e' \in \Lambda_{++}(f, e)$, and $\Lambda_{++}(f, e) = \Lambda_{++}(f, e')$.*

The closure of Λ_{++} in the Euclidean topology is called the *hyperbolicity cone*. It is denoted by Λ_+ and equals

$$\Lambda_+ = \overline{\Lambda_{++}} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_1(x) \geq 0\}.$$

Since linear (LP) and semidefinite programming (SDP) are special instances of hyperbolic programming, we recall the description of their feasible cones in this setting. For LP, the polynomial splits into real linear factors, that is $f = \ell_1 \cdots \ell_d$, with $\ell_i \in \mathbb{R}[x]_1$. For all $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\ell_i(e) > 0, i = 1, \ldots, d$, one has that

$$\Lambda_+(f, e) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \forall\, i \;\; \ell_i(x) \geq 0\}$$

is a polyhedron. For SDP, the hyperbolicity cone of $f = \det(x_1 A_1 + \cdots + x_n A_n)$ in direction e, with A_i real symmetric, and $e_1 A_1 + \cdots + e_n A_n \succ 0$, equals the cone of positive semidefinite matrices in the subspace spanned by $A_1, \ldots, A_n$, that is, a spectrahedral cone.

2. Multiplicities

Let $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ a hyperbolic polynomial (with respect to a fixed point $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$) of degree d. The *multiplicity* of a is the multiplicity of $t = 0$ as an eigenvalue of a, hence as a root of the characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{ch}_a(t) = f(te - a)$, and is denoted by $\mathrm{mult}(a)$. We consider the semialgebraic sets

$$\partial^m \Lambda_+ = \{a \in \Lambda_+ : \mathrm{mult}(a) = m\},$$
$$\partial^{\geq m} \Lambda_+ = \partial^m \Lambda_+ \cup \partial^{m+1} \Lambda_+ \cup \cdots \cup \partial^d \Lambda_+,$$

for $0 \leq m \leq d$, first considered in [18]. The following lemmas give basic results on the multiplicity structure of the boundary of Λ_+ and on its algebraic closure. These will allow us to define explicit equations for algebraic relaxations of Λ_+.

Lemma 2. *For $0 \leq m \leq d$, the set $\partial^{\geq m} \Lambda_+$ is closed and $\overline{\partial^m \Lambda_+} \subset \partial^{\geq m} \Lambda_+$.*

Proof. The inclusion $\partial^m \Lambda_+ \subset \partial^{\geq m} \Lambda_+$ holds by definition. Hence we have to show that $\partial^{\geq m} \Lambda_+$ is closed, which comes simply from the continuity of eigenvalues $a \mapsto \lambda_i(a)$. Indeed, if $(a_\epsilon)_{\epsilon > 0} \subset \partial^{\geq m} \Lambda_+$, then for all $\epsilon > 0$

$$\lambda_1(a_\epsilon) = \cdots = \lambda_m(a_\epsilon) = 0 \leq \lambda_{m+1}(a_\epsilon) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_d(a_\epsilon).$$

Thus if $a_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\epsilon \to 0^+} a$, then $\lambda_1(a) = \cdots \lambda_m(a) = 0 \leq \lambda_{m+1}(a) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_d(a)$, hence $\mathrm{mult}(a) \geq m$ as claimed. □

Note that, typically, neither $\partial^m \Lambda_+$ nor $\partial^{\geq m} \Lambda_+$ are Zariski closed sets, since they are semialgebraic rather than algebraic. Often, in order to develop algebraic techniques, it is desirable to work with real algebraic sets. We therefore define the following:

$$\Gamma_m = \{a \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathrm{mult}(a) \geq m\}, \qquad 0 \leq m \leq d.$$

The sets Γ_m define a nested collection in $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\Gamma_d \subset \Gamma_{d-1} \subset \cdots \subset \Gamma_1 = \{a \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(a) = 0\} = Z_{\mathbb{R}}(f) \subset \Gamma_0 = \mathbb{R}^n.$$

By Lemma 2, we have $\overline{\partial^m \Lambda_+} \subset \Gamma_m \cap \Lambda_+$ (indeed, $\Gamma_m \cap \Lambda_+ = \partial^{\geq m}\Lambda_+$).

Lemma 3. *For any $0 \leq m \leq d$, the set Γ_m is real algebraic and satisfies*

$$\mathrm{Zar}(\partial^{\mathrm{m}}\Lambda_+) = \mathrm{Zar}(\overline{\partial^{\mathrm{m}}\Lambda_+}) \subset \Gamma_{\mathrm{m}}.$$

Proof. The equality $\mathrm{Zar}(\mathrm{S}) = \mathrm{Zar}(\overline{\mathrm{S}})$ always holds, since the Zariski topology is coarser than the Euclidean topology. The inclusion $\mathrm{Zar}(\overline{\partial^{\mathrm{m}}\Lambda_+}) \subset \mathrm{Zar}(\Gamma_{\mathrm{m}})$ follows from $\overline{\partial^m \Lambda_+} \subset \Gamma_m \cap \Lambda_+$, proved in Lemma 2. Hence we only need to prove that Γ_m is real algebraic. Let $0 \leq t \leq d$. Writing

$$\mathrm{ch}_x(t) = t^d + g_1(x)t^{d-1} + \cdots + g_{d-1}(x)t + g_d(x),$$

we deduce that a point $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ lies in Γ_m if and only if t^m divides $\mathrm{ch}_a(t)$. This is the case if and only if all coefficients $g_d = f(-x), g_{d-1}, \ldots, g_{d-m+1} \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ vanish at a. □

The defining equations for Γ_m obtained in the proof can be made more explicit. Let us consider the *modified* characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{ch}_{-a} = f(te + a)$ at a point $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, with respect to f and e. Denote by $\sigma_i(y_1, \ldots, y_d) = \sum_{j_1 < \cdots < j_i} y_{j_1} \cdots y_{j_i}$ the i-th elementary symmetric polynomial on variables $y_1, \ldots, y_d$, then

$$\mathrm{ch}_{-a} = t^d + \sigma_1(\lambda(a))t^{d-1} + \cdots + \sigma_{d-1}(\lambda(a))t + f(a)$$

where $\lambda(a) = (\lambda_1(a), \ldots, \lambda_d(a))$ are the eigenvalues of a. Note that $f = \sigma_d(\lambda(x)) = \lambda_1(x) \cdots \lambda_d(x)$, since $f(e) = 1$.

Corollary 4. *For $0 \leq m \leq d$, we have $\Gamma_m = Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(f, \sigma_{d-1}(\lambda), \ldots, \sigma_{d-m+1}(\lambda)\right)$.*

Proof. Indeed, in the proof of Lemma 3 we have shown that Γ_m equals the real algebraic set $Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(g_d, g_{d-1}, \ldots, g_{d-m+1}\right)$, with $g_d := f(-x)$ and $g_i(x)$ is the coefficient of t^{d-i} in $\mathrm{ch}_x(t)$. Therefore, $g_i(-x) = \sigma_i(\lambda)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$ and hence

$$\Gamma_m = Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(f(-x), \sigma_{d-1}\big(\lambda(-x)\big), \ldots, \sigma_{d-m+1}\big(\lambda(-x)\big)\right).$$

The claim follows from the homogeneity of $f, \sigma_{d-1}(\lambda), \ldots, \sigma_{d-m+1}(\lambda)$. □

We are particularly interested in the *maximum multiplicity* occuring on the boundary of the cone Λ_{++}. For a hyperbolic polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]_d$, this is the integer

$$\max_{a \in \Lambda_+} \mathrm{mult}(a) = \max_{0 \leq t \leq d} \{t : \Gamma_t \cap \Lambda_+ \neq \emptyset\}.$$

This is well defined since $\Lambda_+ \neq \emptyset$ and $0 \leq \mathrm{mult}(a) \leq d$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We now show the maximum multiplicity m is attained on an entire real connected component of Γ_m.

Proposition 5. *Let $f \in \mathbb{R}[X]_d$ be hyperbolic with respect to $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let $m = \max_{a \in \Lambda_+} \mathrm{mult}(a)$. For every connected component $\mathcal{C} \subset \Gamma_m$, with $\mathcal{C} \cap \Lambda_+ \neq \emptyset$, we have*

1. $\mathcal{C} \subset \Lambda_+$
2. $\mathcal{C} \cap \Gamma_{m+1} = \emptyset$.

Proof. First, note that (1) implies (2), because, by definition, m is the maximal multiplicity of points in Λ_+.

To prove (1), let $\mathcal{C}$ be a connected component of Γ_m intersecting Λ_+, and let $a \in \mathcal{C} \cap \Lambda_+$. Note that $\mathrm{mult}(a) = m$ by maximality of m. Suppose that there is $b \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \Lambda_+$; hence $\mathrm{mult}(b) \geq m$ and $\lambda_1(b) < 0$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is connected, there is a continuous path $\varphi\colon [0,1] \to \mathcal{C}$ with $\varphi(0) = a$ and $\varphi(1) = b$. For all $t \in [0,1]$, $\mathrm{mult}(\varphi(t)) \geq m$, and there exists $t_0 \in [0,1]$ such that

(a) $\varphi([0,t_0]) \subset \Lambda_+$ and
(b) $\exists\, \delta > 0$ such that, $\forall\, 0 < \epsilon < \delta$, $\varphi(t_0 + \epsilon) \notin \Lambda_+$.

Define $a_0 = \varphi(t_0)$ and $a_\epsilon = \varphi(t_0+\epsilon)$, for $0 < \epsilon < \delta$, so that $a_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\epsilon \to 0^+} a_0$. Since $a_\epsilon \notin \Lambda_+$, then $\lambda_1(a_\epsilon) < 0$ for all $0 < \epsilon < \delta$. More precisely, since $\mathrm{mult}(a_\epsilon) \geq m$, then for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $i(\epsilon) \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(a_\epsilon) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{i(\epsilon)}(a_\epsilon) < 0 \\ \lambda_{i(\epsilon)+1}(a_\epsilon) = \cdots = \lambda_{i(\epsilon)+m}(a_\epsilon) = 0 \\ 0 \leq \lambda_{i(\epsilon)+m+1}(a_\epsilon) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_d(a_\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit for $\epsilon \to 0^+$, by the continuity of the eigenvalues and since $a_0 \in \Lambda_+$, we find that $\lambda_1(a_0) = \cdots = \lambda_{m+1}(a_0) = 0$, that is $\mathrm{mult}(a_0) \geq m+1$, which contradicts the fact that m is the maximum multiplicity. □

Proposition 5 provides us with a way of computing the largest multiplicity on the hyperbolicity cone Λ_+, and of representing one point where this maximum value is attained. More precisely, we consider the *non-convex* optimization problem

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{l} \max \ \ \mathrm{mult}(x) \\ \ s.t. \ \ x \in \Lambda_+(f,e) \end{array}} \tag{1}$$

By the hyperbolicity of f, $\Lambda_+ \neq \emptyset$, hence this problem is feasible and there always exists $a^* \in \Lambda_+$ such that $\mathrm{mult}(a^*) = m = \max_{a \in \Lambda_+} \mathrm{mult}(a)$. By Proposition 5, the whole connected component $\mathcal{C}^*$ of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{mult}(\Lambda_+)}$ containing a^*, is included in Λ_+.

We conclude that Problem (1) can be solved by computing at least one point per connected component of the real algebraic sets $\Gamma_m, m = 1, \ldots, d-1$. This is a central routine in computational algebraic geometry, for which exact algorithms have been designed, see *e.g.* [1, 17] or the monograph [2] with its references. By exact representation, we mean via a rational univariate representation [19]: this is a vector $(q, q_0, q_1, \ldots, q_n) \in \mathbb{Q}[z]^{n+2}$ such that the set

$$\left\{ \left(\frac{q_1(z)}{q_0(z)}, \ldots, \frac{q_n(z)}{q_0(z)} \right) \ : q(z) = 0 \right\} \tag{2}$$

intersects every connected component of the given algebraic set. In (2), q and q_0 are coprime, therefore the set is well defined and finite. Its cardinality is bounded above by $\deg q$.

The best complexity bounds for computing representations as in (2) are essentially polynomial in the number of equations defining the algebraic set (which for Γ_m is at most m, by Corollary 4) and in the maximum of their degree (bounded above by d) and singly exponential in the number of variables. These come out of the so-called critical points method [2, Ch. 16], or the successful effective theory of polar varieties [21, 22].

In this paper we are not focusing on complexity results for hyperbolic programming, but our efforts are especially devoted to the design of algebraic methods for this problem. However, Proposition 5 and the mentioned results, according to the previous complexity analysis, give a singly exponential algorithm to represent a solution to Problem 1 in exact arithmetic, which is worth being highlighted.

We conclude this section with an example and comment on computational issues of Problem 1 for the case of the elliptope. This is the feasible set of the SDP-relaxation of the MAX-CUT combinatorial optimization problem [6].

Example 6 (Elliptope). Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n = \binom{d}{2}$, and let $\mathscr{E}_d^{(h)}$ be the homogeneous d-elliptope. This is the spectrahedral cone of dimension $n+1$ defined by the linear matrix inequality $A(x) \succeq 0$ with

$$A(x) = \begin{bmatrix} x_0 & x_{1,2} & \cdots & x_{1,d} \\ x_{1,2} & x_0 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & x_{d-1,d} \\ x_{1,d} & \cdots & x_{d-1,d} & x_0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

That is $\mathscr{E}_d^{(h)} = \{x = (x_0, x_{1,2}, \ldots, x_{d-1,d}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : A(x) \succeq 0\}$. It is the linear section of codimension $d-1$ of the cone of $d \times d$ real symmetric positive semidefinite matrices whose main diagonal is constant. Every matrix in $\mathscr{E}_d^{(h)}$ is also called a correlation matrix (see [11] and references therein).

We propose two distinct tests on Example 6. The results that we present have been obtained on a desktop PC, with CPU architecture with the following characteristics: `Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-4620 0 @ 2.20GHz`. For the sake of reproducibility, the corresponding Maple scripts are made available on the webpage of the first author[1].

Test 7. Since $A(x)$ in Example 6 is homogeneous, and since, by positive semidefiniteness, a_0 must be nonnegative for all $a \in \mathscr{E}_d^{(h)}$, we dehomogenize and put $x_0 = 1$. We recall that $\det A(x)$ is hyperbolic with respect to $e = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)$.

The authors of [11] proved that the vertices of $\mathscr{E}_d^{(h)}$ (defined as those boundary points whose normal cone is full-dimensional) are characterized as all the rank one matrices in $A(x)$ with entries in ± 1. These are exactly the connected components with maximum multiplicity $\mathrm{mult}(\mathscr{E}_d^\circ) = d-1$ intersecting $\mathscr{E}_d$, as foreseen by Proposition 5.

These points can be computed efficiently in practice. We make use of the Maple library SPECTRA [9], which is targeted to computing low rank solutions of linear matrix

[1] `www.mathematik.tu-dortmund.de/sites/simone-naldi/software`

inequalities. As explained in [9], the command `SolveLMI(A,{all},[1])` (when called in a Maple worksheet where SPECTRA has been previously loaded, and where the variable `A` is instantiated to $A(x)$) computes all components with highest multiplicity, namely isolated matrices of rank 1.

To give an idea of performances, we are able to solve our problem for $d \leq 5$ in less than half second, or for $d = 8$ (corresponding to an elliptope of dimension 21, and computing $2^7 = 128$ solutions) in around 2.5 minutes. ■

A second test is performed for the elliptope, without exploiting the spectrahedrality of $\mathscr{E}_d^{(h)}$, but just relying on the hyperbolicity of $\det A(x)$.

Test 8. We generate the sets Γ_m, $m = 1, \ldots, d$, as the zero locus of the polynomials defined in Corollary 4. For every m, we sample the real connected components of Γ_m and check how many of the solutions lie in $\mathscr{E}_d$, using the Maple library RAGLIB [20]. The function `PointsPerComponents` allows us to sample the real connected components of the sets Γ_m, $m = 1, \ldots, d$, computing rational parametrizations as in (2). The goal is to sample many points on the boundary of $\mathscr{E}_d$, possibly with different multiplicities. Note that, *a priori*, Proposition 5 guarantees that this method yields at least one feasible point for the maximum multiplicity.

The results are summarized in the following table:

d	m	# samples	# feasible	mult $= m$	CPU time
2	1	2	2	2	0.07 s
3	1	10	4	0	0.7 s
3	2	4	4	4	5.1 s
4	1	36	10	6	26 s
4	2	36	36	30	24 s
4	3	10	8	8	34 s

For a fixed d and for a given multiplicity $m = 1, \ldots, d-1$, the number of sample points computed by RAGLIB is given in the third column, those lying on $\mathscr{E}_d$ in the fourth, and those of the expected multiplicity in the fifth column; then, we report on the average time on 1000 tries on our standard desktop PC.

We also note that one computes points with multiplicity which can be larger than the expected one (that is, matrices whose rank is smaller than expected). For example, for $d = 3$ and $m = 1$, the four points on $\Gamma_1 \cap \mathscr{E}_d$ actually belong to $\Gamma_2 \subset \Gamma_1$, and correspond to those solutions computed in the subsequent step $m = 2$. Moreover, in contrast with SPECTRA in Test 7, one can even sample multiplicities smaller than the maximal one, as for the case of the 4-elliptope. Already for the 5-elliptope, however, the computation becomes quite prohibitive, which is coherent with the exponential theoretical complexity. ■

In these tests, we have seen that points of maximum multiplicity can be computed efficiently in practice using LMI exact solvers in the case of hyperbolic polynomials with determinantal representation. On the other hand, larger multiplicities can be

computed on general hyperbolicity cones $\Lambda_+(f,e)$ by sampling the loci Γ_m, but with clear limitations in terms of the degree of f.

3. Hyperbolic programming

Hyperbolic programming is a convex optimization problem specified as follows. We are given a homogeneous polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ of degree d, with $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, hyperbolic with respect to $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and a linear map $\ell\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$.

The *hyperbolic program* associated to data (f, e, ℓ) is

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{rl} \ell^* = & \inf\ \ell(x) \\ & s.t.\ \ x \in \Lambda_+(f,e) \end{array}} \tag{3}$$

An important remark is in order about the feasibility of Problem (3). Since $\Lambda_+(f,e) \neq \emptyset$ by definition, then $\ell^* < +\infty$. This feature distinguishes hyperbolic programming from other convex optimization problems (recall that both in SDP and in LP the feasible set might be included in hyperplanes or empty).

Since the objective function of Problem (3) is linear and the feasible set is convex, when the infimum is attained at x^*, then $x^* \in \partial\Lambda_+$. The boundary $\partial\Lambda_+$ is defined, locally, by the coefficients of the modified characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{ch}_{-x}(t)$, as in Corollary 4. We now formalize this relationship between solutions to Problem (3) and multiplicity loci.

A local minimizer of a continuous function $\ell\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ on a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a point $x^* \in S$ such that there exists an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x^* \in U$ and $\ell(x^*) \leq \ell(x)$ for all $x \in U \cap S$. We can reduce Problem (3) to the computation of local minimizers on the multiplicity loci Γ_m as follows.

Theorem 9. *Let f, e, ℓ be the data defining Problem (3). Let $x^* \in \Lambda_+(f,e)$ with $\ell(x^*) = \ell^*$, and let $m^* = \mathrm{mult}(x^*)$. Then x^* is a local minimizer of f on Γ_{m^*}.*

Proof. Since we are minimizing a linear function over a non-empty convex set, the minimizer (if it exists) belongs to the boundary of the feasible set, hence $m^* > 0$.

Next, we denote by $\mathcal{C}^*$ the connected component of Γ_{m^*} containing x^*. First, we suppose that $\mathcal{C}^* \not\subset \Lambda_+$ and that $W \cap (Z_{\mathbb{R}}(f) \setminus \Lambda_+) \neq \emptyset$ holds for every open set $W \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ containing x^*. We show that this situation cannot occur. Indeed, since $\mathcal{C}^* \not\subset \Lambda_+$, we easily deduce $W \cap (\Gamma_{m^*} \setminus \Lambda_+) \neq \emptyset$ for all W as above. Let B_k be the open ball with center x^* and radius $1/k$, for $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. For all such k, we can choose $x(k) \in B_k \cap (\Gamma_{m^*} \setminus \Lambda_+)$, yielding a sequence $x(k) \xrightarrow{k\to\infty} x^*$. We deduce that $\lambda_1(x(k)) < 0$ holds for all k, and hence $\lambda_{m^*+1}(x(k)) \leq 0$ (because at least m^* eigenvalues of $x(k)$ must vanish). Passing to the limit, we find $\lambda_{m^*+1}(x^*) = 0$; since $x^* \in \Lambda_+$, we get $\lambda_j(x^*) = 0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m^* + 1$, which implies $\mathrm{mult}(x^*) \geq m^* + 1$, which is a contradiction.

Now, two cases remain to be analyzed:

Case A : $\mathcal{C}^* \subset \Lambda_+$. Thus $\ell(x^*) \leq \ell(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{C}^*$, that is x^* is a (global) minimizer of ℓ on $\mathcal{C}^*$, hence a local minimizer of ℓ on Γ_{m^*}.

Case B : There is an open set $W \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x^* \in W$ and $W \cap (Z_{\mathbb{R}}(f) \setminus \Lambda_+) = \emptyset$. In other words, W meets $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(f)$ only at feasible points. Hence x^* minimizes ℓ on $W \cap \Gamma_{m^*}$, hence it is a local minimizer of ℓ on Γ_{m^*}. □

We now give a formal description of an *algorithm* for Problem (3). The idea is to represent local minimizers of the map ℓ on the set Γ_m via first-order conditions involving additional Lagrange multipliers. Let $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ be the polynomials defining Γ_m (see Corollary 4). A local minimizer x^* of ℓ on Γ_m is encoded by the following system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 = 0, \ \ \ldots, \ \ f_m = 0 \\ z_1 \nabla f_1 + \cdots + z_m \nabla f_m = \nabla \ell \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

which means that there exists $z^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that (x^*, z^*) satisfies system (4). When the number of singular points of the complex set $\{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : \forall\, i = 1,\ f_i(x) = 0\}$ is finite, which turns out to be often satisfied, the solutions of system (4) consist of these singular points and the smooth minimizers of ℓ.

We suppose now that we are given a routine RP that, when given as input a zero-dimensional ideal $I \subset \mathbb{R}[x, z]$, returns the rational parametrization (2) for the finite set $Z(I \cap \mathbb{R}[x]) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. Algorithms to compute such parametrizations have appeared *e.g.* in [19, 5, 10]. The routine LAG is supposed to build the system (4) from data f, e, ℓ, m. The formal description of our algorithm is as follows:

Algorithm 1 SolveHP

```
1: procedure SolveHP(f, e, ℓ)
2:     L ← { }
3:     for m = 1, ..., d − 1 do
4:         L ← L ∪ RP(LAG(f, e, ℓ, m))
5:     return L
```

The output of **SolveHP** is a set of rational parametrizations. The union of their solutions contains the solution to Problem (3), according to Proposition 9.

3.1. **Examples.** We have implemented Algorithm 1 in Maple and used it to recover exact information on examples from the literature.

Example 10 (Quartic symmetroids). We consider the list of nodal quartic symmetroids given in [16]. The authors of [16] associate to every transversal quartic spectrahedron

$$\mathscr{S} = \{x = (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : A(x) \succeq 0\},$$

a couple (ρ, σ) of nonnegative integers, where ρ corresponds to the number of nodes (quadratic singularities) of the projective hypersurface $\{x \in \mathbb{P}^3(\mathbb{R}) : \det A(x)\}$, and

$\sigma \leq \rho$ is the number of nodes lying on $\partial\mathscr{S}$. We denote the quartic of type (ρ, σ) in the list in [16] by $\mathscr{S}_{\rho,\sigma}$.

The goal is to perform a random analysis on the solutions of SDP instances over these sets. While this is similar to [15, Table 2], our exact viewpoint can certify the multiplicity at a given solution; indeed, once the representation (2) is computed, isolating the real roots of q allows to compute the signs of the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial $\det(t\mathbb{I} - A(x))$ exactly, hence to decide feasibility and multiplicity. The same is not possible with standard SDP solvers.

$\mathscr{S}_{\rho,\sigma}$	$m^* = 1$	$m^* = 2$	$\mathscr{S}_{\rho,\sigma}$	$m^* = 1$	$m^* = 2$
$\mathscr{S}_{2,2}$	98 %	2 %	$\mathscr{S}_{4,0}$	100 %	0 %
$\mathscr{S}_{4,4}$	62 %	38 %	$\mathscr{S}_{6,2}$	32 %	68 %
$\mathscr{S}_{6,6}$	58 %	42 %	$\mathscr{S}_{8,4}$	17 %	83 %
$\mathscr{S}_{8,8}$	22 %	78 %	$\mathscr{S}_{10,6}$	7 %	93 %
$\mathscr{S}_{10,10}$	75 %	25 %	$\mathscr{S}_{6,0}$	100 %	0 %
$\mathscr{S}_{2,0}$	100 %	0 %	$\mathscr{S}_{8,2}$	15 %	85 %
$\mathscr{S}_{4,2}$	36 %	64 %	$\mathscr{S}_{10,4}$	14 %	86 %
$\mathscr{S}_{6,4}$	46 %	54 %	$\mathscr{S}_{8,0}$	100 %	0 %
$\mathscr{S}_{8,6}$	63 %	37 %	$\mathscr{S}_{10,2}$	18 %	82 %
$\mathscr{S}_{10,8}$	86 %	14 %	$\mathscr{S}_{10,0}$	100 %	0 %

We draw random linear forms $\ell \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3]_1$ with coefficients uniformely distributed in $\mathbb{Z} \cap [-100, 100]$, and we compute the solution in (3) with $f = \det A(x)$ and $e = \mathbb{I}_4$. The multiplicities of a solution $x^* \in \mathscr{S}_{\rho,\sigma}$ in this case corresponds to the corank of $A(x^*)$.

In Table 12 we report on the percentage for the multiplicity at a minimizer on 1000 tries. There are only two possible multiplicities, that is 1 and 2. Feasible points with multiplicity 2 correspond to the singularities of the determinant lying on $\mathscr{S}_{\rho,\sigma}$.

We finally generated other representatives of the classes. We observe that percentages can change; indeed these depend not only on the topology of the symmetroid, but also on how the singularities on $\partial\mathscr{S}_{\rho,\sigma}$ are exposed. We believe that this approach can be useful to solve similar classification problems of larger size. ■

Algorithm 1 still works without the assumption that f has a determinantal representation. We test our algorithm on one such example.

Example 11. Let $A(x)$ be a 5×5 homogeneous symmetric linear matrix in 4 variables x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, with $A(e) \succ 0$ for some $e \in \mathbb{R}^4$. Let $f = \det A(x)$. Then the directional derivative of f in direction e

$$D_e^{(1)}(f) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} e_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}$$

is hyperbolic with respect to e, but in general does not admit a determinantal representation. For example, let

$$A(x) = \begin{bmatrix} x_0+x_3 & 2x_1+2x_3 & x_1+3x_3 & x_2 & x_2+3x_3 \\ 2x_1+2x_3 & x_0+4x_1+3x_3 & x_1-x_2+6x_3 & x_1+x_2-2x_3 & x_1+x_2+4x_3 \\ x_1+3x_3 & x_1-x_2+6x_3 & x_0+x_1+8x_3 & -x_1-x_2-3x_3 & -x_1-x_2+6x_3 \\ x_2 & x_1+x_2-2x_3 & -x_1-x_2-3x_3 & x_0+x_2+x_3 & x_1+2x_2-x_3 \\ x_2+3x_3 & x_1+x_2+4x_3 & -x_1-x_2+6x_3 & x_1+2x_2-x_3 & x_0+x_2+4x_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then $f = \det A(x)$ is hyperbolic with respect to $e = (1,0,0,0)$, and the quintic real hypersurface $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : f(x) = 0\}$ has four singularities. The derivative $D_e^{(1)}(f)$ defines a singular quartic, still with four nodes and hyperbolic with respect to e (see Figure 1), which is not representable as a determinant of a symmetric pencil. Let $\Lambda_+(D_e^{(1)}(f), e)$ be its hyperbolicity cone.

Optimizing generic linear functions over $\Lambda_+(D_e^{(1)}(f), e)$ yields solutions of multiplicity one (smooth boundary points) for 64% of the time, and solutions corresponding to singular points (of multiplicity 2) for 36% of the time, on average. An example of multiplicity two (in this case, a rational solution) is

$$x_0 = \tfrac{1}{2} \qquad x_1 = 0 \qquad x_2 = \tfrac{1}{2} \qquad x_3 = 0$$

and one smooth point on the boundary of $\Lambda_+(D_e^{(1)}(f), e)$ (multiplicity one), whose coordinates are given as elements of certified rational intervals, with 10 significant decimal digits is given by

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 &\in [\tfrac{1697352983372573029285}{1180591620717411303424}, \tfrac{212169122921574321063}{147573952589676412928}] \approx 1.437713900 \\ x_1 &\in [-\tfrac{29707767148026666593}{147573952589676412928}, -\tfrac{29707767148024593931}{147573952589676412928}] \approx -0.2013076605 \\ x_2 &\in [-\tfrac{18765770300641154993}{73786976294838206464}, -\tfrac{18765770300640685591}{73786976294838206464}] \approx -0.2543236116 \\ x_3 &\in [\tfrac{21153099339285995043}{1180591620717411303424}, \tfrac{661034354352767111}{36893488147419103232}] \approx 0.01791737208 \end{aligned}$$ ■

In our last example, we show how our algorithm can certify lower bounds of Renegar's method, which uses derivative cones for hyperbolic programming.

Example 12 (Nie, Parrilo, Sturmfels [14]; Saunderson, Parrilo [23]). We consider the semidefinite representation of the 3-ellipse, as computed in [14]. Given n points $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and a nonnegative real number D, the n-ellipse is the plane compact curve consisting of those points the sum of whose distances to $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ is D. This set is the boundary of a spectrahedral hyperbolicity cone $\mathcal{E}_n$, for every D. Moreover, one has the stronger property that the algebraic boundary of $\mathcal{E}_n$ is a determinantal hypersurface [14]. However, it may be advantageous not to compute such a determinantal representation and work with the hyperbolic polynomial directly.

The boundary $\partial\mathcal{E}_n$ could contain one or more nodes, and if this happens, these coincide with some of the base points $p_1, \ldots, p_k$. Let $A = A(x, y, z)$ be the linear matrix representation of $\mathcal{E}_3$ given in [23, Example 1], and let $f = \det A$. The corresponding 3-ellipse $\mathcal{E}_3$ has the semidefinite representation $\{(x, y, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : A(x, y, 1) \succeq 0\}$.

Our exact algorithm, as we have already remarked, is able to certify rational approximation of the coordinates of a solution, its multiplicity, and also the optimal value of the linear function on the solution. In order to measure the error when considering Renegar relaxations for solving hyperbolicity programs, we consider the relaxations of $\mathcal{E}$, namely the hyperbolicity cones of the derivatives of $\det A$ in the direction $e = (0, 0, 1)$. The infimum of the linear function $\ell(x, y, z) = x + 2y + 3z + 4$ on $\mathcal{E}$ is attained at the unique point of multiplicity 2, that is (projectively) at $(3, 0, 1)$. We optimize the same linear function over the derivative relaxations and look at the optimal value.

In the table below, k denotes the order of derivation of $\det A$, and x^*, m^* denote, the solution and the optimal multiplicity, respectively. We remark that the degree of the algebraic representation of our exact algorithm decreases when considering derivative relaxations.

k	$\approx x^*$	m^*	$f(x^*)$	Degree
0	$(0.750, 0.000, 0.250)$	2	5.500000000	56
1	$(0.759, -0.018, 0.258)$	1	5.499158216	42
2	$(0.797, -0.051, 0.250)$	1	5.456196445	30
3	$(0.862, -0.116, 0.254)$	1	5.392044926	20
4	$(0.981, -0.254, 0.273)$	1	5.292250029	12
5	$(1.336, -0.762, 0.426)$	1	5.090555573	6

References

[1] S. Basu, R. Pollack, and M-F. Roy. On the combinatorial and algebraic complexity of quantifier elimination. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 43(6):1002–1045, 1996.

[2] S. Basu, R. Pollack, and M-F. Roy. A new algorithm to find a point in every cell defined by a family of polynomials. In *Quantifier elimination and cylindrical algebraic decomposition*. Springer-Verlag, 1998.

[3] E. De Klerk. *Aspects of Semidefinite Programming. Interior-Point Algorithms and Selected Applications*. Springer, 2010.

[4] L. Gårding. An inequality for hyperbolic polynomials. *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics*, 8(6):957–965, 1959.

[5] M. Giusti, G. Lecerf, and B. Salvy. A Gröbner-free alternative for polynomial system solving. *Journal of Complexity*, 17(1):154–211, 2001.

[6] M.X. Goemans and D. Williamson. Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cuts and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming. *Journal of the ACM*, 42:1115–1145, 1995.

[7] O. Güler. Hyperbolic polynomials and interior point methods for convex programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 22(2):350–377, 1997.

[8] D. Henrion, S. Naldi, and M. Safey El Din. Exact algorithms for linear matrix inequalities. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 26(4):2512–2539, 2016.

[9] D. Henrion, S. Naldi, and M. Safey El Din. Spectra: a Maple library for solving linear matrix inequalities in exact arithmetic. *Submitted to ACM TOMS*, 2016. Maple library downloadable at `http://www.mathematik.tu-dortmund.de/sites/simone-naldi`.

[10] G. Jeronimo, G. Matera, P. Solernò, and A. Waissbein. Deformation techniques for sparse systems. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 9(1):1–50, 2009.

[11] M. Laurent and S. Poljak. On a positive semidefinite relaxation of the cut polytope. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 223:439 – 461, 1995.

[12] S. Naldi. Solving rank-constrained semidefinite programs in exact arithmetic. In *Proceedings of the 41th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, Waterloo, Canada*, 2016.

[13] Y. Nesterov and A. Nemirovsky. *Interior-point polynomial algorithms in convex programming*, volume 13 of *Studies in Applied Mathematics*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 1994.

[14] J. Nie, P.A. Parrilo, and B. Sturmfels. *Semidefinite Representation of the k-Ellipse*, pages 117–132. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2008.

[15] J. Nie, K. Ranestad, and B. Sturmfels. The algebraic degree of semidefinite programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 122(2):379–405, 2010.

[16] J. C. Ottem, K. Ranestad, B. Sturmfels, and C. Vinzant. Quartic spectrahedra. *Math. Program.*, 151(2):585–612, July 2015.

[17] J. Renegar. On the computational complexity and geometry of the first-order theory of the reals. Part I: Introduction. Preliminaries. The geometry of semi-algebraic sets. The decision problem for the existential theory of the reals. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 13(3):255 – 299, 1992.

[18] J. Renegar. Hyperbolic programs, and their derivative relaxations. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 6(1):59–79, 2006.

[19] F. Rouillier. Solving zero-dimensional systems through the Rational Univariate Representation. *Appl. Algebra Engrg. Comm. Comput.*, 9(5):433–461, 1999.

[20] M. Safey El Din. Raglib (Real Algebraic Geometry library), Maple package. 2007.

[21] M. Safey El Din and É. Schost. Polar varieties and computation of one point in each connected component of a smooth real algebraic set. In *ISSAC'03*, pages 224–231. ACM, 2003.

[22] M. Safey El Din and É. Schost. Properness defects of projections and computation of at least one point in each connected component of a real algebraic set. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 32(3):417–430, 2004.

[23] J. Saunderson and P. A. Parrilo. Polynomial-sized semidefinite representations of derivative relaxations of spectrahedral cones. *Mathematical Programming*, 153(2):309–331, 2015.

Technische Universität Dortmund, Fakultät für Mathematik, Vogelpothsweg 87, 44227 Dortmund

E-mail address: Simone.Naldi@math.tu-dortmund.de

E-mail address: Daniel.Plaumann@math.tu-dortmund.de